



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

Formation of a Sociological Society.—There was held last week, in the rooms of the Royal Statistical Society, a conference to consider the question of the formation of a society for the promotion of scientific and philosophical studies in sociology. In the unavoidable absence of Mr. Bryce, who had agreed to take the chair, the meeting was presided over by Mr. E. W. Brarook, president-elect of the Economic Section of the British Association. Among those present were: Professors Adamson, Bosanquet, Haddon, Hewins, Geddes, and Carveth Read, Dr. C. M. Douglas, M.P., Mr. H. Samuel, M.P., Dr. J. H. Bridges, Mr. Oscar Browning, Miss Collett, Mr. T. C. Horsfall, Mr. Leonard Hobhouse, Mr. Benjamin Kidd, Mr. C. S. Loch, Dr. R. D. Roberts, Mrs. Sidney Webb, and Mr. J. Martin White.

Approvals of the project to form a sociological society were read from the following, among others: Professor Alexander, Professor Bain, Professor Bastable, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. F. H. Bradley, Rev. Professor Caldecott, Professor Chapman, Sir John A. Cockburn, Mr. E. Clodd, Rev. Professor E. W. Collins, Mr. A. Emmott, M.P., Rev. Principal Fairbairn, Rev. Professor Flint, Sir W. Foster, Professor Graham, Professor Ingram, Rev. F. B. Jevons, Dr. Scott, Keltie, Professor Ray Lankester, Professor Latta, Master Macdonell, Professor J. S. Mackenzie, Dr. Henry Maudsley, Dr. Leslie Mackenzie, Mr. R. Nevill, K.C., Mr. B. S. Rowntree, Mr. Bertrand Russell, the bishop of Stepney, Mr. M. E. Sadler, Mr. A. Sherwell, Professor James Seth, Professor Sorley, Professor Sully, Professor J. Arthur Thomson, Mr. H. G. Wells, and Dr. Wynn Westcott.

The following letter was read from the prime minister:

"10 Downing street, Whitehall, S. W., June 26, 1903.

"DEAR SIR: I am obliged to you for your letter of June 24 and its inclosures. I welcome any attempt to organize sociological investigations on a strictly scientific basis. I understand this to be the object of the proposed society, and, if so, I heartily wish it success.

"I remain yours faithfully,

"ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR."

Professor White wrote: "I regard the formation of such a society as very desirable, and the want of one with an appropriate literary organ as a very serious defect."

On the motion of the chairman, seconded by Dr. C. M. Douglas, M.P., the following resolution was submitted to the meeting and unanimously adopted: "This meeting resolves that a society be formed for the promotion and organization of those studies which are increasingly pursued under the title of sociology."

In support of the resolution the chairman said that any sociological society formed at the present moment would start with the great advantage over the old Social Science Association, in that a body of sociological doctrine had since then been built up by the labor of Spencer and others. But, even apart from that, it was not altogether a disadvantage for societies which had existed for a generation to be dissolved and reconstituted. The present society would be a revival of the best interests of the old Social Science Association, strengthened by the scientific work which had been done in the interval. He asked those present to very carefully consider the question whether the work that was proposed for the new society was being, or could be, done by any of the existing learned societies. For his part he thought the proposed society had work of its own to do which was not being done at present, and he asked the meeting to support this conclusion.

Dr. Douglas, M.P., stated his conviction of the desirability of the formation of the society, both for the encouragement of scientific studies in sociology and also for the diffusion of the scientific spirit in popular thought about political, and social phenomena. He referred to his connection with a sociological society which formerly existed in Edinburgh—a city which Professor Geddes had made a home of sociology.

The resolution was supported by Dr. Bridges, Professor Haddon, Professor

Hewins, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Benjamin Kidd, Dr. Roberts, Mr. J. A. Hobson, and by Mr. J. Martin White, who announced an offer of £1,000 to London University for the establishment of a preliminary course or courses in sociology, meaning, he said, thereby the study of social development, organization, and ideals in all forms of society from the highest to the lowest, with the view of constructing, not only a reasoned theory of society, in relation with the highest philosophical thought of the day, but also of enunciating principles of action suitable to the guidance of contemporary life.

On the motion of Mr. Oscar Browning, seconded by Mr. Leonard Hobhouse, and supported by Professor Geddes, a committee was appointed to consider the question of the scope and aims of the proposed society, and to draft a constitution to be submitted to a meeting in the autumn.

Mr. Oscar Browning, in speaking to this resolution, recalled the fact that Sir John Seeley had frequently said to him that in founding the Historical Tripos in Cambridge he had intended that it should develop into a Sociological Tripos, and Mr. Oscar Browning considered that the Historical Tripos had been successful in so far as it had been sociological and had been unsuccessful in so far as it had not been sociological. —*London Times*, July 6, 1903.

Economic Independence of Woman.—Two great revolutions are in process of accomplishment: the emancipation of the workman and the emancipation of the woman. As the emancipation of the workmen ought to be accomplished by the laborers themselves, that of woman ought to be accomplished by woman herself. Since it is by labor that men have been able to organize themselves and gain their independence, it is by labor that women must organize themselves and gain their economic and political independence. But it is necessary to distinguish between the organized labor which elevates the laborer and the overdriving and exploitation which brutalizes and annihilates. It is this latter form of slavery that women too often suffer.

Domestic labor is scarcely yet organized and has not been modified throughout the centuries.

The *bourgeoise* woman retards this emancipation, as she too often does not possess as much economic independence as the working woman. She follows the tradition which permits her to exchange some domestic duties, more or less badly fulfilled, and some sexual functions, for the necessities and luxuries of life. She contents herself with an economic state in which no proud man would allow himself to be held by another.

It is true that a pretty extensive choice of employments is offered to woman, but such employments are for the most part so poorly paid that men do not want them, and as parents are not in the habit of preparing their daughters in the technical and professional instruction given to boys, working women are almost all known as unskilled workers. Woman has some traditional and false ideas upon obligation and domestic devotion. She fritters away her time, and too often renders her home uninhabitable, in futile efforts to be at the same time tailor, laundress, ironer, cook, and mother of the family. These labors are carried on from early morn till night, and the odors of the washing and cooking charge the air and render it unwholesome. The children are neglected or employed as aids in this unorganized labor at the age when they ought to be receiving an education and learning orderly habits.

The care of children, after the first year, ought to devolve upon the municipality, which should establish *crèches* and some recreation parks under the supervision of specialists. The children would there be free from the contaminations of the street and receive scientific care up to the age of entering school. The woman would then be free to work in the interest of the community during five or six hours of the day.

At present, conscience and initiative are relatively awakened in the woman of every class. The aristocratic woman begins to discover that labor often renders life more interesting. The *bourgeoise* woman begins to learn that the education of her daughters ought not to consist in a mixture of the arts of pleasure and household work; that it is better to prepare children to earn economic independence.

It is only the work outside of the home which can be organized and made to elevate the worker. By degrees the woman learns that to earn a little sum weekly

represents an economic and social independence that her non-paid labor at the hearth had never given. The economic independence of woman renders possible for the first time the realization of the highest human relations, based upon affection and above the suspicion of constraint and of the commercial spirit. Those who object to the married woman working in factories forget that her cares and hardships are none the less in the home. It is necessary that women organize themselves into mutual-aid societies, with or without the aid of the state, in order to secure a pecuniary aid at the period of maternity. All women who work should interrupt their occupations at the time of *couches* and during the months of nursing. It is necessary that they have a subvention for such interruptions, so that they may not be tempted to resort to vice for a livelihood. Under the régime of socialism this subvention would be granted by the state. Every adult, not physically incapacitated, would labor as a member of the community and be paid for the work done. A woman in giving to the state a new citizen would have a right to a payment under form of a subvention. At present, governments deem it better to spend the millions contributed by the people in manufacturing destructive arms and in encouraging inventions designed to kill or wound the greatest number upon the field of battle. If by means of private organization or state aid women could have a subvention at the time of *couches* and a pension during the first year of the life of the infant, they would escape an economic slavery which, during the centuries, has had a most grievous influence. Under this insurance régime, the pension ceasing at the death of the infant, it is probable that many more of the little children would survive.

"In acting conformably to these principles the woman of the twentieth century will come out from her isolation and inconstancy and will begin to enter in line with the progressive movement of the new century, which someone has predicted will be the century of the woman."—DORA B. MONTEFIORE, "L'indépendance économique de la femme au XX^e siècle," in *Humanité nouvelle*, No. 47, May, 1903.

J. D.

Inter-Psychology.—This expression, "social psychology," or its equivalent, "*collective psychology*," does not satisfy me. It is ambiguous. It has been abused by mystic spirits who have given currency to a certain conception of society—making of it one gigantic brain composed of our smaller brains, with a *social self* distinct from each individual consciousness. Moreover, this expression presupposes in fact the existence of what is called a social environment, that is, a social group already formed and numerous enough for each individual self to receive in it, from the mass of the other selves joined in one confused whole, a suggestive influence which has become somehow impersonal and anonymous, and which, moreover, is usually reciprocal.

I think we should substitute the study of a science at once more general and more exact, and which may be called inter-mental or inter-cerebral psychology, but which I should prefer to call, more briefly, "inter-psychology." This term is more general, because it includes not only all social relationships, looked upon subjectively, but also many inter-cerebral relationships which are in no way social. Not all inter-psychoic relationships are social phenomena. Many inter-mental actions, so far from being, in themselves and considered separately, social phenomena, are rather obstacles to the social bond; *e. g.*, the suggestion of hatred, or of cannibal appetite, or of fear, or of a cruel scientific or political experiment to be made *in anima vili*. It is quite otherwise with the suggestion of sympathy, of confidence, of obedience. When a living being, by his mere presence, fascinates or tames another, even of a different species, a social bond begins to be forged between them. Every social bond consists, directly or indirectly, in the reflection at a distance of one self in another self. Social psychology, of which sociology is the outgrowth and the objective complement, is only a *part* of inter-psychology—the part dealing with imitation.

"Inter-psychology" is a more general and a more exact term than "social psychology." New distinctions must be made. When the object of our perception, thought or will, is itself a perceiving, thinking, and willing subject, the case is already, as we know, highly differentiated from all acts of perception, thought, and will which have for their object an inanimate thing. But further, when the person whom we perceive is perceived by us as perceiving us; when we conceive the person we think of and seek to understand as thinking of us and trying to understand us; when the

person we wish to possess or master appears to us as striving to master us and use us for his own ends—then a second step has been taken, as significant as the former. These are marvelous phenomena of psychic symmetry, like that of two mirrors which reflect each other and so give to each other the mutual illusion of infinite depth.

Elementary inter-mental action has been thoroughly studied, on its abnormal and pathological sides, by the hypnotists; and they may be regarded as the earliest founders of inter-psychology. Alienists and criminologists, who have produced such interested monographs on double insanity, and double suicide or crime, have also made exact contributions toward elucidating this fundamental problem. Studies on timidity, and especially those on crowds, have also been valuable contributions. But it is essential that we give them their place in the outlines of a psychology of the sane and normal, and these outlines we must first lay down.

Inter-psychology has its own divisions and methods. From the genetic point of view, it begins with the study of the infant from the time of its first mental relations with people about it; and the evolution from this inter-psychology of the infant to that of adults is of the highest social interest. From the theoretic and general point of view, we should study in the abstract, and separately, the action of sense-impressions upon sense-impressions, or of will upon will, and of intelligence upon intelligence. It is to be noted in this connection that sensations, and the concepts of sensations, are by no means communicable as such; but only ideas, plans, beliefs, and desires. Feelings are to inter-psychology what sensations are to the psychology of the individual. Sensations are a tangled skein, complex and confused, which the individual brain unravels as best it may, and from which it draws its ideas of space, time, matter, and force—not to mention the antithesis of pleasure and pain. Feelings are another skein, far more complex and richer yet, which the life of society both produces and disentangles, and from which it draws the social categories of right and duty, as well as the great antithesis of good and evil. Feelings are signs of our social relationships, just as sensations are signs of our physical relationships with natural agents. Three questions arise: first, why some feelings are or are not propagated in a given environment, at a given moment; second, how they are propagated, and by what methods; third, the transformations they undergo in the process.—GABRIEL TARDE, "Inter-Psychology, the Inter-Play of Human Minds," in *International Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 1.

A. D. S.

Religions and Their Social Role.—There is a certain temerity in subjecting religions to the scientific method of study. But it is difficult to see why such a method should not be faithfully employed in so great a subject, especially when we are in possession of a large and accurately dated body of knowledge on the great religions, their principles and practices. We purpose to study the Hebrew-Christian religion—it being the prevailing religion in the most advanced civilization—with special reference to the social organization accompanying it. What part has the religious factor had in determining the contemporaneous social order? Let us go back to the early history of the Jewish religion. This religion was in its strength about four centuries before the Christian era among a small people in a mountainous country between Syria and Egypt. Previous to the fourth century B. C. this religion seems to have been a sort of mixture of the cults of the neighboring tribes. It had many gods, but there was one patron god, a chief, Jehovah.

After every hope of a national existence had been cut off by the captivity of 586 B. C., the Jews had the extraordinary chance of renewing their existence under the form of a religious group at the time of the restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah. Then was established the religion that for so many centuries was destined to dominate in the civilized nations. This Judaism, greatly modified by the Christian element grafted upon it, is the point of departure for the religious history of civilization.

What has been the social rôle of Judaism? What its political significance? The object of religion is not social progress, though it must be inseparably united to this. Has this Judaism-Christianity respected the rights of the citizen and the government of the state? Has it encouraged the progress of science and education? Has the religious man been interested in all movements of moral betterment? The great ancient states, Sparta, Athens, and pagan Rome, non-Christian states, respected

the liberties of the individual, freedom of thought, right of private property, security of person, rights as citizen. Not only in their internal affairs, but also in their foreign relations, were these nations quite advanced.

In modern times as in all times the position of a strong and able-bodied man is determined by his labor. But to the aged, the women, and the children, those not able to work, the state should guarantee a living. It should also protect those who do labor by a minimum wage and maximum hours. But do we find in any religion a feeling of this responsibility except perhaps in the form of alms-giving? Further, the state should take the lead in publishing statistics of public value, on questions of public health, on the housing of the working people, etc., etc. The state, too, should give to its youth the best opportunities of education — an education by frank, rational, and sincere methods, without fraudulent reticence or attenuated deceptions. But what does this religion say on this point? It makes but a sorry attempt in doubtful formulas and categorial declarations. It does not provide even for the health of the mind, so essential to the health of the body.

If we go back to the accepted records of Judaism, the essence of the prevailing Christianity, and ask what part it has had in the evolution of society, under such headings as: the rights of the individual; public freedom, or liberty of the state; the condition of man, of woman, and of minors; public health, public instruction, progress of the arts and sciences; the reform of justice, and the abolition of war, we shall find that Judaism has been found wanting.

The little kingdom of Judah, situated between the great powers of Africa and of Asia, and furnished with few warriors, could not reasonably hope for political independence. To ally themselves with the peoples of Asia or with those of Egypt would mean to give up their God, Jehovah. But in spite of this reasonable and inevitable political dependence, we find Jeremiah and all the other prophets declaring, in substance, that for such a political alliance Jehovah will be avenged upon them, and, moreover, declaring that all the misfortunes of Israel had been visited upon her because she had forsaken Jehovah. The religion was not only not a good thing for the political welfare of the Jews, but was a weakening and terrifying element. The religion of the Jews as set forth in the Bible was such as to render good internal affairs and foreign relations impossible. The rôle of Judaism has been, on the whole, more hurtful than helpful in the social development of the countries in which it has been perpetuated in Christianity.—MAURICE VERNES, "Les religions et leur rôle sociale," in *L'humanité nouvelle*, July, 1903.

T. J. R.

Sociology and the Social Sciences.—Sociology is said to be the science of social facts, but these facts are already the subject-matter of a multitude of special sciences such as history, law, statistics, economics, etc. If sociology has the same object as the special sciences, then it is confounded with them, and is only a term to designate them collectively. If sociology is a separate science, it must have an object peculiar to it and different from that of the other sciences.

In fact, neither of these suppositions is tenable. Sociology is only the system, the *corpus*, of the social sciences, and it necessitates a radical change in the method and organization of them.

To define sociology as only the system of the social sciences would seem at first to put it in opposition to its founders. However, it is certain that Comte recognized sociology only as an integral speculation, closely attached to general philosophy; not a special science, but a universal science. Positive philosophy is itself sociology. The special sciences form one homogeneous system. The unity of the positive method does not prevent their specialization. Comte considered political economy outside of the positive philosophy simply because of its false method, its sterile discussions of elementary notions of value, utility, production, which recalled the debates of the scholastics of the Middle Ages upon the fundamental attributes of pure metaphysical entities.

In the last twenty years there has been a veritable efflorescence of sociological literature and many new systems. In nearly every case the effort is made to reduce the science to a single problem. For one writer it is the law of imitation, for another the law of adaptation, or the struggle for existence, especially among races,

etc. Indeed, to see all of these workers searching the supreme law, the cause which governs all causes, the key that opens all locks, recalls the efforts of the alchemists to discover the philosopher's stone. The result has been a recoil rather than progress. For Comte, at least, sociology was an integral science of all of the social facts; no category of phenomena was systematically excluded.

Some writers attempt to find a distinct field for sociology by assigning to it the consideration of what is *general*, as distinguished from what is special. For instance, Stuart Mill defines sociology as having for an object the consideration of the "state of society," including only the most important social phenomena, such as the form of government, laws and customs, moral culture, etc. Thus sociology is made independent of the other social sciences and is to furnish deductions as a basis for them. Manifestly the position of Mill is untenable. To generalize from so many different phases of life is a task too large for one man, and furthermore the definition of "general" is vague.

Mr. Giddings uses "general" in another sense. He considers the elementary forms of social life as distinguished from the higher and more complex forms. His sociology is a science of first principles which are to be a basis for the special social sciences. Other sciences suppose sociology, but it does not suppose them. Unfortunately these elementary forms do not exist anywhere in isolation and available for observation. The most elementary societies are complex and contain all the elements which differentiate in the course of evolution. To limit the sociology to special societies is to reduce it to a study of comparative ethnology. The general is found only in the particular, and that which is called human association is a characteristic of all societies. There is already a science which studies the laws of population—demology. Mr. Giddings goes into still other fields of science, discussing the family, etc. The object thus assigned to sociology is indeterminate; it is a sociology which determines itself, arbitrarily according to the personal inclination or taste of the author.

The sociology of Messrs. Tarde, Gumplowicz, Ward, and others would be still more difficult to define and separate from the special social sciences.

There is no need to isolate such or such aspect of society and make it the object of a new science, as there is no need that biology treat such and such aspect of vital phenomena rather than another. Sociology is nothing if it is not the science of societies, considered altogether. The multitude of the phenomena renders it necessary that the study of society be divided into specialties. Hence sociology is only the system of the sociological sciences.—E. DURKHEIM ET E. FAUCONNET, "Sociologie et sciences sociales," in *Revue philosophique*, No. 5, May, 1903.

J. D.

The Race Problem.—Three years ago I said that, unless heroic measures were adopted, we should soon have civil war between the races. The Evansville riot is an example of what we may expect tomorrow wherever negroes are numerous, and very little later in such cities as New York and Boston and Philadelphia. The North is already almost as fully inoculated as the South, and the young white American of the lower classes is becoming educated everywhere with appalling rapidity to understand that any negro accused of crime is public spoil, to be played with as long as the fun will last. Attempts at general massacres of negroes are certain to be the next thing in order, and collective reprisals by negroes are equally certain.

Negro-lynching is already a permitted exception in the midst of our civilization. Bloody orgy and diseased idea emotion have struck an unholy partnership, impunity is agreed upon, and an anonymous mob is the power to which the license is accorded. The newspapers are doing all they can to convert the custom into an established institution. I first learned of the recent negro-burning at Wilmington by seeing the scare head of a paper which a man on a seat before me in a car was reading. "Charred in Chains, Lynching Well Done," was printed in tall capital letters in this Boston daily. One of our most influential New York weeklies, formerly an independent journal, printed an editorial on the same atrocity, of which the only influence on a susceptible mind could be to make it seem excusable. Everywhere we find educated men and women making light of the baseness, as being, after all, only a rude sort of justice, just as old-fashioned Christians used to say that Jews must continue to

be baited for the honor of our Savior. Negro lynching claims more and more the character of a public right. It appeals to the punitive instinct, to race antipathy, and to the white man's pride, as well as to the homicidal frenzy. One shudders to think what roots a custom may strike when a fierce animal appetite like this and a perverted ideal emotion combine together to defend it.

One or two real fanatics there may be in every lynching, actuated by a maniacal sense of punitive justice. They are a kind of "reversion," which civilization particularly requires to extirpate. The other accomplices are only average men, victims of the moment when the greatest atrocities are committed, of nothing but irresponsible mob contagion, but invited to become part of the mob and predisposed to the peculiar sort of contagion, by the diabolical education which the incessant examples of the custom and of its continued impunity are spreading with fearful rapidity throughout our population. Was ever such a privilege offered? Dog-fights, bull-fights, prize-fights, what are they to a man-hunt and a negro-burning? The illiterate whites everywhere, always fretting in their monotonous lives for some more drastic excitement, are feeding their imaginations in advance on this new possibility. The hoodlums in our cities are being turned by the newspapers into as knowing critics of the lynching game as they long have been of the prize-fight and football. They long to possess "souvenirs." They agree on the belief that any accused negro is their perquisite and property, and that to burn him is only the newest form of the white man's burden. How far this education has already proceeded we are likely to learn any day in a startling manner. And the supineness of our officials and the mealy-mouthed utterances of our journals seem to me to reveal an incredible misunderstanding of the real situation. No student of history or knower of human nature could be so fooled for a moment.

I unhesitatingly stand by my prophecy, for there is nothing now in sight to check the spread of an epidemic far more virulent than the cholera. The fact seems recognized that local juries will not indict or condemn; so that, unless special legislation *ad hoc* is speedily enacted, and unless many "leading citizens" are hung—nothing short of this will check the epidemic in the slightest degree, and denunciations from the press and pulpit only make it spread the faster—we shall have negro burning in a very few years on Cambridge Common and the Boston Public Garden.—Letter of PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES, in the *Springfield Republican*.

The Promotion of Industrial Efficiency.—The present inquiry deals with methods and systems used in Germany, England, and the United States for obtaining that active co-operation between capital and labor now essential for the maintenance of position as a manufacturing country.

In Germany the movement has been in the direction of reform in the social conditions of the workers rather than toward high wages and bonus systems. In most of the larger German engineering works we find elaborate arrangements and organizations for the comfort of the workers during working hours. The state system of insurance against sickness, accident, and old age also assists in ameliorating the lot of the German worker and renders him content with longer hours of work and with lower wages than those customary in the United Kingdom and America. Mr. Barnes, secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, remarks in his report: "The general protection of workmen and provision for their comfort is much more complete than in this country (England), and the shops are much more spacious and cleanly. . . . Another common feature is the use of first-class appliances. A no less marked feature . . . is the leisurely manner in which the men go about their work. With one exception, in all the shops visited, men smoked during working hours, and in most of them there were canteens or other provision for getting refreshments while at work."

In the United Kingdom the majority of works are still conducted on the *laissez-faire* principle of the Manchester school of economists. The teaching of this school results in paying the worker the smallest possible wage, and in making none but the legally necessary provisions for his social or physical comfort. Under these conditions the usual relation between employers and employed is one of antagonism. The conversion of private firms into joint-stock companies in recent years has still further tended to widen the breach between capital and labor. The directors of a few of the

larger and better-managed works have recognized the unwisdom of treating their employees rather worse than their machines, and have instituted social and other agencies for the amelioration of the life of the workers. In these cases the agencies are on the same lines as those found in Germany. Systems of profit-sharing and other schemes for the social and educational advancement of the workers are exceptional in English works and factories.

American methods: In the United States we find elaborate arrangements for obtaining the co-operation of the workers. In some few instances these take the form of social agencies, but in the majority of instances a bonus system, based on a high normal level of wages, is employed, and every man is allowed free scope for individual effort and ability. The comparative feebleness of trade-unionism in the States has undoubtedly facilitated the introduction of this system of allowing each man a free hand, and of paying him exactly what he can earn. Whether the conditions which have favored its introduction will continue is doubtful in view of the spread of militant unionism in the States.

On account of the widespread adoption of bonus and premium systems of payment in the United States, there is considerably less activity in the promotion of social schemes and agencies for the benefit of workers than in England and Germany. The details of the organization of such workers as the National Cash Register Co., of Dayton, O., which maintains a number of social and educational agencies for the benefit of its workpeople, and the pickle factory of H. J. Heinz & Co., at Pittsburg, with its baths and concert and dining halls for the entertainment of workers, show that America is not without examples of enlightened treatment of work people, apart from pecuniary rewards of labor.—J. B. C. KERSHAW, in *Engineering Magazine* for June. A. B.

Decrease in the Size of American Families.—The failure of the Harvard students to produce their share of the present generation is but a single example of a widespread condition. Statistics of Middlebury, Wesleyan, and New York Universities show that the students of those institutions also multiply at a diminishing rate.

The most plausible explanation is that of conscious restriction of offspring. Greater prudence, higher ideals of education, more interest in the health of women, interests of women in affairs outside of the home, the increased knowledge of certain fields of physiology and medicine, a decline in the religious sense of the impiety of interference with things in general, the longing for freedom from household cares — any and all of these may be assigned as the motive for the restriction. The only other explanation is the physiological infertility of the social, and perhaps of the racial, group to which college men and their wives belong.

It is possible to do more than speculate about the relative shares of unwillingness and incapacity. The figures themselves tell a plain story to the student who examines them in the light of recent knowledge of the variability of physical traits.

In the case of artificial restriction, there would appear in the statistics an increase in the number of small families and a proportionate decrease in large families, whereas in cases of diminished reproductive capacity, there would appear in the statistics a falling off in the size of all families, and not an increase of small families and a decrease of large ones. As a matter of fact, the statistics show a general decline in the size of all families, and point to the conclusion that the decrease is due to incapacity rather than voluntary restriction.

So far as our general mental prepossessions go, a real decrease in fertility seems at first sight a preposterous doctrine. One can well imagine the sneer of the physician whose experience emphasizes the frequency of restriction, and the pitying smile of the biologist who discerns that a progressive decrease in fertility of a species is a flat contradiction of the doctrine of natural selection. "Play on with your statistical hair-splitting," they would say, "nothing that you find will disturb our beliefs. We know better."

But the experiences of metropolitan physicians will not serve to prophecy the social psychology of the species we have studied. Their opinions may be as wide of the mark as the common belief that unwillingness is the main cause of the failure of the women of the better classes to nurse their children. As to the contradiction of natural

selection, it is to be remarked that the existence, amount, and results of the elimination of types by their failure to produce their kind constitute a problem which only statistical inquiries can settle, and if the doctrine is to be used as an excuse for evading certain obvious facts in human history, it is perhaps time that it should be questioned.

"So far as present facts go, the probability is against natural selection in the case of fertility in man. The contrary hypothesis, that a stock like an individual has a birth, growth, senescence, and death; that, apart from the onslaughts of rivals or the privations of a hard environment or the suicide of universal debauchery, races die a natural death of old age, lends itself very well to the interpretation of human history, and perhaps to the history of animal forms as well. It leaves the causation of this race life and death as a mystery. But a mystery is less objectionable than a contradiction."—EDWARD L. THORNDIKE, in *Popular Science Monthly*.

J. D.

Juvenile Criminality.—After a study of statistics and from personal observation of the size of the families from which the young offenders came, and of the incomes of these same families, I am persuaded that crime among children is the product of their surroundings and misery rather than of heredity. I have sought in vain for that type described by Lombroso. I have seen youths bearing many marks of degeneracy, adolescents deeply perverted, wilfully rebellious against discipline, capable of every excess, evidencing complete contempt for authority; but I have never found that type that is said by the Italian school to be the immediate product of heredity. I do not deny that heredity may have an influence, but the origin of the tendency to crime has wretchedness (*misère*) for the prime factor. I am absolutely convinced of its predominating influence. The child is not born a criminal; he becomes a criminal.

The wretchedness that is so fruitful of crime may be resolved into lack of good food, and often of any kind of food; lack of clothes; lack of room, light, ventilation, and soap; absence of any moral influence in the home and no parental supervision. Children are pushed out into the streets to earn a penny; no questions are asked by the parents of their whereabouts. The salvation of this class can be found only in a system of schools under the management of correctional and penal institutions, or perhaps in the state taking the place of parents to these children. The great problems in giving these children a school training are in providing the means and the method of separating them into groups or classes according to their intellectual and associational needs.

From statistics on repeated arrests grouped according to ages; from statistics on arrests distributed among different ages; from a classification of offenses according to ages of the offenders; from experiences with various "colonies" of correction; and remembering that groupings must be for averages rather than extremes, I believe that the age at entrance into these schools should be made the basis of classification. Promotions and "demotions" can easily be made when evidently demanded. Because there is a close parallelism between the age and the viciousness of the criminal tendency, such a classification promises best to protect the younger from the hurtful influence of the older. There is seemingly a closer relation between age and criminal tendency than between literacy and criminal tendency. Where the isolation of younger from older has been best carried on in France there has been a gratifying decrease in criminality among the younger. More perfectly to isolate the older group—from fourteen to sixteen years of age—it would seem advisable even to have entirely separate institutions.

Another change that would be quite helpful in the effort to reclaim these youths and children is a system of juvenile courts in which the individual boys should be regarded and large discretion be given the judge, and the method be such as not to belittle, but to encourage, the boy brought before the court.

The results of the efforts in France in the direction of schools and reformed judicial procedure seem to be a decrease in the extent of juvenile crime, but not a corresponding change in the character of the offenses. Indeed, the average of offenses seems to grow worse. This is explained by the cutting off the minor offenses of the younger; and the greater difficulty of reforming the older and worse offenders. —M. GROSOLARD, "Criminalité juvénile," in *Archives d'anthropologie criminelle*, April and May, 1903.

T. J. R.

World-Currents in Charity, Theory, and Practice.—In the past there has been great lack of system, co-operation, and regulation of all charitable institutions. The tendency now is toward a federation of philanthropy. As persons of various occupations, trades, arts, and professions federate and confer together with advantage to themselves and the public, so charitable workers and students are forming associations in local, state, national, and even international societies for kindred purposes.

An uppermost question is that of state supervision and control of public and even of private philanthropy and relief. In the administration of penal and charitable institutions the necessity for central control has been everywhere legally recognized except in the United States. In Germany alone there is no such system of public supervision in relation to outdoor relief. This defect is due to the efficiency of the municipal system, which is independent of voluntary charity. By combining central supervision with local responsibility for details, the best results are obtained. State boards of control should be salaried administrators and experts, but it is desirable that they be subject to supervision; otherwise such boards will come to feel infallible and omiscient. Secrecy, which hides all perils and abuses, is unavoidable with a board of control without a legal method of supervision independent of it. Reports on forms provided by statute are deceptive; there is no substitute for the inspection of a living person. There are various methods of organizing for free and independent inspection of public institutions. In the English prison system a board of visitors has considerable influence. The New York Charities Aid Association is a typical example of an independent society, legally recognized and exercising a vast influence.

Private charities must ultimately be subjected to governmental supervision and control. This suggestion will be resented by those who have been brought up in the frontier conditions. Some states have already made progress in that direction, beginning with those associations which receive subsidies. It is true that such control is often a mere pretense, and, at the best, public inspection is not infallible, even with national banks and interstate commerce boards. But this is true of administration generally in American cities and commonwealths, and the remedy lies in improving the service, not in inviting anarchy to remain.

Notable efforts are now being made in the matter of preventing crime, pauperism, etc., by instituting savings banks, playgrounds, insurance against economic ruin from accidents, sickness, and the feebleness of old age. So important has this subject of preventive methods seemed to many practical workers that the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1902 provided for a commission of seven persons to consider and report on plans for insurance of wage-earners against accident, sickness, invalidism, and old age. The commission is to be continued for at least three years before making its final report. It has already mapped out an investigation and divided the topics among the members, and invites contributions.—CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. J. D.

Conditional Condemnation of Criminals.—In 1842 an English magistrate, without precise legal authority, began the practice of suspending all condemnation in the case of young delinquents brought before him, placing them under the oversight of a suitable person and reserving the right to apply the penalty later, if necessary. In case of a second offense by the same child, the two acts were subject to a double condemnation. Later this practice became legalized. In 1869 the state of Massachusetts, inspired by the English example, inaugurated a similar practice, appointing a probation officer to look after each young delinquent. The period of probation for each was two years. The policy having produced good results, the city of Boston in 1878 extended the law so as to apply to adults in the case of the first offense, or in case of an offense of little importance. Twenty or more of the United States have since adopted the same general policy.

In 1886 New Zealand passed an act permitting the conditional release of first offenders on probation.

France and Belgium adopted the conditional condemnation in the year 1891.

A peculiarity of the French system is that the court pronounces condemnation and fixes in advance the exact amount of punishment, then suspends the punishment upon condition of good behavior. The advantage of this system is that it gives the

condemned no hope of escape in case of a relapse. If the penalty were not fixed in advance, one might hope to escape the penalty for the first offense through disappearance of the witnesses, failure to preserve the evidence, etc. With the penalty fixed in advance, it is a menace more certain and consequently more efficacious. In France the suspension can be applied in case of all sentences to imprisonment and the period of probation is five years. In Belgium the suspension applies only where the penalty is not more than six months' imprisonment. The duration of the probation is left to the discretion of the judge.

Statistics as to the result of this policy in the several countries are incomplete in that some countries have no correct record of the number of relapses.

However, the progressive application of the system and the low rate of relapses where statistics are available, testify sufficiently to the good results of the policy. In France about one-fourth of the criminals entitled to the suspension have had it applied to them. The number of suspensions has increased from 11,807 in 1891 to 28,497 in 1899. The relapses in 1899 amounted to only 1.4 per cent.

The French system has been adopted in Portugal, Norway, Switzerland, and other countries.—R BÉRENGER, "Des résultats de la condamnation conditionnelle," in *Bulletin de l'Union Internationale de Droit Pénal*, Vol. X, No. 2, p. 302.

J. D.

The Formative Principle of Sociology.—Every science has a great formative principle. It is ever at work transmitting constructive energy. The lines of its operation may be new to men, but in reality are as old as creation. Wherever on the face of the earth two or more men and women have lived and labored and loved, there the rudiments of the science are traceable. All the time they have throbbed in the social body and moved it on to destiny.

The present need of understanding as clearly as possible the formative principle of the science is very real. There are many voices in the air seeking to make the matter plain. The practical effect of one is this: Separate out the really good people, and consign the rest to dealings of an uncertain providence. This is the old argument of "the remnant." It has always resulted in failure for all concerned. Another says: "Begin society anew; wipe out the past, and begin on a new basis." There is no such thing as freeing the present from the past: tomorrow, today will be a part of it.

The unseen cords of moral gravitation bind all members of associated life together. A particle of lifeless matter might as well try to escape the power of gravitation exercised on it by all the rest of the round world, and of the stars in heire course, as for one to attempt to cut the invisible cords of connection and influence which vitally make him one of the social body. One particle of reality touches every other particle, whether it be of matter or spirit. So that the social problem is this: How can I and my neighbor live and work together for mutual advantage?

The purposed disregard of this great social fact has often resulted in making some of the bloodiest and most uncalled for pages of history. It was the custom in France and all continental Europe, not many generations ago, to regard all the good things of the earth as predestined for the few; the many did not count. This self-imposed delusion developed into a social tornado. The Civil War was waged to scourge out and beyond the republic the pagan contempt of labor and the laborer. It conclusively proved that the other man, the seller of muscle and skill, whether white or black, could not be eliminated.

There never was a profounder yet simpler statement of necessary sociological relation than the words of Paul: "None of us liveth to himself." Love is the belief that I and my neighbor ought to live peaceably and advantageously together, ripened into conviction. With every inch of social gain it makes more clear and certain that out of present discussion shall come more satisfying views of mutual obligation, and these in turn shall give foundation to a perfected society. The law of love is the formative principle of sociology.—REV. BURNETT T. STAFFORD, in *Bibliotheca Sacra* A. B.

Effects of the Conditional Reprieve in France.—From 1892 to 1899 the annual number of reprieves granted by the courts of assizes was 61, 36, 25, 32, 24, 43, 48, 51. These figures are insignificant except as showing a tendency to increase.

But in that which concerns the *correctionnelle* recidivist, this measure of qualified clemency, of intelligent indulgence, has produced in France the most happy results. In 1892, in the cases of 17,881 persons receiving the benefit of the conditional reprieve, there were 665 revocations; or, to express it otherwise, the relapses into crime amounted to 3.6 per cent. In 1899, in the cases of 28,497 persons receiving the conditional reprieve, there were 1,831 revocations. The percentage of relapses had fallen to 1.4 per cent. Formerly the juvenile offenders were sent to prison for a short term and returned only to augment crime.

The collective conscience is generally scandalized by the impunity of the culpables, but how does it happen that it accepts with manifest sympathy these half-acquittals which in reality enable 98 or 99 per cent. of the persons concerned to remain unpunished? It is because, if materially these half-acquittals do not differ from real acquittals, they nevertheless are spiritual condemnations, and that is the essential fact. "The true penalty, as the true government, being public opinion, that which is important, from the point of view of social defense, is much less the execution of the penalty than the judicial announcement." The social need to which criminal justice responds is not to render blow for blow, evil for evil, but to pronounce official condemnation upon the offender. The number of months in prison or amount of fine serves above all to measure the gravity of the censure. In case the penalty is never executed it would still conserve its metric value, that would not be indifferent. "But in case of the conditional reprieve it is something more. It is a writ of execution under condition, and this penalty upon paper is like fiduciary money which loses nothing of its exchange value when it is convertible into gold. Let us add that tribunals elevate to a much higher level the penalties that they pronounce with the help of the reprieve than they would be able to do without it. The law of 1892 has therefore effectively remedied the abuse of the short terms and at the same time has placed in fuller light the whole subjective nature and moral foundation of penal repression."—G. TARDE, "La loi du sursis conditionnel et ses effets en France," in *Bulletin de l'Union Internationale de Droit Pénal*, Vol. X, No. 2, p. 299.

J. D.

The Importance to be Attributed in the Criminal Law to the Psychic Elements of Crime in Comparison with its Material Consequences.—It is important to distinguish between the different ends the penal law proposes. In the first place to defend society against the hurtful activity of a delinquent is the question. For this end it is necessary to apply the most appropriate measures, to paralyze the delinquent's anti-social activity, or better, to transform it into a social activity. The determination of proper measures to secure this result will depend evidently on an exact knowledge of the psychological constitution of the delinquent.

M. Garraud insisted that the criminal should be punished for what he had done and not for what he was. If the punishment should be determined by the character of the criminal, he must be treated for what he is, and not for what he had done.

Nevertheless, the psychic factor to be taken into consideration cannot be of one exclusive kind. Account must be taken, on the one hand, of the fact that the social defense is not carried on solely for repressive ends and only against the delinquent, and, on the other hand, of the fact that criminal justice is executed in all peculiarities of social conditions.

The social defense should be not only repressive, but also preventive. In regard to the defensive function, the measures applied to the delinquent will have an intimidating character. One certain thing cannot be mistaken; that in our day societies are defended against crime only by intimidation.

Penal law in order to obtain its entire efficacy must in its application obtain the complete adhesion of public opinion, or, if one wishes, the social conscience. If the masses do not adhere to the penalties proposed by the penal law, the law will be used to deprive the delinquents of a chastisement which is repugnant. Inversely, if society, moved by a crime, does not obtain satisfaction, it will make an application of private justice. There should be a complete concord between the decisions of criminal justice and social conscience.—M. GAUCHLER, in *Bulletin de l'Union Internationale de Droit Pénal*, Vol. X.

A. B.

Suicides in the United States.—Statistics of suicides obtained from newspaper reports for the period 1897–1901, embracing 29,344 cases, mostly in the New England states, show results in part as follows: The ratio of male to female suicides is $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. The most popular age for suicide is from thirty to forty. Slightly more married than single people of both sexes commit suicide. Single, widowed, and divorced women commit more suicide than men in like situations.

As to method, shooting comes first and poison second. Most women prefer poison. Usually women employ methods which do not mutilate the body. At the age of seventy they prefer drowning.

The cause of suicide in most cases is said to be despondency, but often other causes lie hidden behind this word. Next to despondency come, in order, business loss, ill-health, insanity, disappointed love, domestic trouble, etc. Women are more likely to commit suicide from grief, disappointed love, domestic trouble, or ill-health than men. Few women commit suicide from business loss. Females commit suicide at an earlier age than males, this is because the former develop earlier. Sufferers from business loss, mostly males, prefer shooting; boys disappointed in love also prefer this method as more dramatic. The despondent prefer poison. Those who have lost friends or relatives expire by gas or hanging. Most suicides happen on Monday: Sunday comes in for second choice. From 9 P.M. to 12 P.M. is the favorite time of the day. Shooting is pretty evenly distributed throughout the day, but suicides from ill-health and insanity usually come early in the morning, while those from disappointed love and family trouble come late in the evening. Drowning and hanging are most common in the afternoon.—WILLIAM B. BAILEY, in *Yale Review*, May, 1903. J. D.

Anthropology and the History of Religion.—That religion has come to be studied historically, that the study of it has been made a part of a philosophic discipline, that it is considered a chapter in universal history—these are new and significant facts for religion itself and indicate a marked change in attitude toward that field of thought and activity. Religion is now subjected to a scientific method of study. One result of this new method is the modification of the so-called Comtean classification of religion into fetishism, or animism, or naturalism, and polytheism, and monotheism. These three—fetishism, polytheism, and monotheism—do not represent, according to our view, successive stages in the organization of cults and the construction of dogma; they do not express types of practice and belief nicely separated and distinct, but forms of religion in which a given element receives one value in one form and another value in another form; for example, the doctrine of the Trinity is historically derived from polytheism. Another result of this method is that not one form of religion, but elements from all religions—in fact, elements common to all—command our assent.

This study has been made along three great lines: (1) by way of archæology and philology; (2) by way of a critical examination of the sacred literatures, documents, and monuments of the great religions; (3) by way of anthropology. The third division takes account of the ethnographic and the prehistoric archæological body of facts, that is, the reconstruction of primitive societies which preceded the age of written or inscribed monuments. The contributions by these several ways of approach promise to be confirmatory and indicate a great gain in rationality for religious activity, and give added significance to the fact of religion.—MAURICE VERNES, "Histoire des religions et anthropologie" in *Revue de l'école d'anthropologie de Paris*, May, 1903.

T. J. R.

The Victory of Protectionism in Switzerland.—The federal chambers had adopted, according to the law passed October 10, 1902, a new customs tariff which was the triumph of the protectionist school. But as, in accordance with the federal constitution, it sufficed that 30,000 electors demand the referendum in order that the law be submitted to popular vote, they divined that the free-traders would look well after their interest in the campaign. They had very little trouble in securing the 30,000 signatures, and January 10 they announced triumphantly that they had received 110,564 adherents. At the head of the movement were the signatures of the towns of Basel, Geneva, Neuchâtel, Glarus, and Zurich. The free-traders had good reason to combat the new tariff, as may be seen from a comparison of the tariff of 1891 with

that of 1902. The referendum was fixed for March 15, and on that day the people decided in favor of the new tariff by a vote of 330,366 against 222,668. The day after the vote a deputy wrote us from Berne: "The protectionists have persuaded the citizens that the new tariff was a necessary measure to safeguard our exports. For my part, I do not believe it, as, for the most part, protectionism is an economic and political principle. But others voted for the tariff because Switzerland could not remain free-trade when all the states of Europe were protectionist. And you, dear economist, what did you do?" I replied: "The new tariff will increase the price of living; it will prevent strangers from taking up their residence in Switzerland; it is doubtful that it favors exportation, but it is certain that it will prevent useful importations. It is a prohibitive rather than a protective tariff. I voted against it."—A. BÉCHAUX, "La victoire du protectionisme en Suisse," in *La réforme sociale*.

Betting and Gambling.—If betting and gambling (which may be considered as equivalent to a series of bets) have these two elements in them: (1) the issue upon which one stakes is uncertain; (2) one backs one's opinion, stands to win or lose as one's opinion proves correct or false—if these are the elements in betting, life, strife, and play may all be considered in a measure betting. The uncertainty in the great decisions of life, and the impossibility of escaping the consequences of the choice, need but to be mentioned to be seen as possessing the essentials of the bet. Likewise competition, whether in the academy, in politics, in business, or in civil service, as clearly contains the common elements mentioned above.

But it is in what we have called play that betting and gambling are most commonly thought to be practiced, and it is in this activity, the narrower use of the term, that it is most often cried against. It is impossible to separate sport from business or business from sport in our complex systems. Stock exchanges and ball games are not purely business or purely sport. The ethical quality of betting can be judged only by estimating its effect upon character and upon society. Here, too, the result is difficult of determination. It may not be too radical to say, however, that gambling in business is not legitimate business; it is only a parasite, it leads to no increase in utility, is anti-economic and anti-social. Again, in aiming at his own success, a man when betting for the purpose of making money is always aiming at another's failure; and this attitude is certainly immoral. It certainly is difficult to pronounce off hand upon the morality of betting when the desire of gain is not the leading motive. But an amusement which requires an extraneous stimulus of a small stake to keep it alive is apt to tend more and more to rely on this adventitious issue, and thus to pass by insensible degrees into the "gamble," in which gain is, if not the sole, at any rate a dominating, motive.—W. R. SORLEY, "Betting and Gambling," in *International Journal of Ethics*, July, 1903.

T. J. R.

Reform Program of German Dwellings and Settlements.—A general improvement of dwellings and settlement relations is a pressing necessity for the great mass of the people of Germany, as well among the well-to-do as among the poorer classes, but especially among the latter. This necessity is not confined to those who dwell in the cities, but includes also those who dwell in the country, and not only in the case of the industries, trades, and related callings, but also those on farms, in the forests, and engaged in related activities. The reform concerns itself not only with the improvement of dwellings, but also, and principally, with the improvement of the relations of settlements. This comprehensive reform has to deal with the entire range of local questions, especially the premises of dwellings and the causes of grievance arising in local politics, and these not only here and there, but everywhere. It has to deal with the great manifold of misunderstandings and their causes, to apply a great mass of different rules, and presents itself to its task as to a great whole intrinsically united, but made up of diverse parts.—DR. K. V. MANGOLDT, "Ein Reformprogramm für die Wohnungs- und Ansiedlungsfrage in Deutschland," in *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik*, Vol. XVIII, 1903.

A. D. S.